



Steven M. Neuhaus  
County Executive

## Orange County Department of Planning

124 Main Street  
Goshen, NY 10924-2124  
Tel: (845) 615-3840  
Fax: (845) 291-2533

David E. Church, AICP  
Commissioner

www.orangecountygov.com/planning  
planning@orangecountygov.com

### County Reply – Mandatory Review of Local Planning Action as per NYS General Municipal Law §239-l, m, &n

**Local Referring Board:** Town of Newburgh Zoning Board of Appeals

**Referral ID #:** NBT24-14M

**Applicant:** Jin Kanajanakiritumerong - Grabek

**Tax Map #:** 66-2-3

**Proposed Action:** Area Variance related to one side yard, combined sideyards, and 10 ft setback of accessory structure. Use variance to allow hair salon in the I/B District.

**Local File #:** PB Ref 1

**Reason for County Review:** The real property parcel involved in the proposed action is within 500 feet of NYS Route 300.

**Date of Full Statement:** June 10, 2014

#### Comments:

County Planning is in receipt of the GML §239 referral for the above referenced Project. Based upon our review of the submitted materials, our office has found no evidence that significant inter-municipal or county-wide impacts would result from its approval. County Planning recommends that the Board make a decision only after weighing the benefit to be realized by the applicant against the potential detriment to the health safety and general welfare of the neighborhood and/or community. In relation to the use variance, in an effort to aid the Board in making their decision, our office recommends working with the Appellant to understand the unnecessary hardship outlined in §267-b(2)(b) of the which consists of the following:

- *“In making such determination the board shall also consider: (1) the applicant cannot realize a reasonable return, provided that lack of return is substantial as demonstrated by competent financial evidence; (2) that the alleged hardship relating to the property in question is unique, and does not apply to a substantial portion of the district or neighborhood; (3) that the requested use variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood; and (4) that the alleged hardship has not been self-created.”*

In relation to the area variance(s), in an effort to aid the Board in making their decision, our office recommends working with the Appellant to understand the balancing test outlined in §267-b(3)(b) of the NYS Town Law which consists of the following:

- *“(1) whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance; (2) whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance; (3) whether the requested area variance is substantial; (4) whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district; and (5) whether the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the board of appeals,*

reclude the granting of the area variance.”

termination



---

**David Church, AICP**  
**Commissioner of Planning**

A. 9-m & n, within 30 days of municipal final action on the above referred project, the final action taken with the County Planning Department. For such filing, please use the review or available on-line at [www.orangecountygov.com/planning](http://www.orangecountygov.com/planning)